

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9 and 12-31 are pending in this application. Claims 8, 17 and 18 have been amended. New claim 32 has been added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 21-25, 30 and 31 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 18, 27 and 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claims 17 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 6720580) in view of Nakashima et al. (US 6774965). Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 6720580) in view of Nakashima et al. (US 6774965) in view of Baek et al. (US 20020036730). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 6720580) in view of Nakashima et al. (US 6774965) and Baek et al. (US 20020036730) in view of Auman et al. (US 5856432).

Without conceding the merits of the rejections, in order to place the application in condition for allowance, applicants have incorporated features of claim 18 into claim 17. Further, on a telephonic interview held on January 25, 2008 between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if amended to include "a protecting layer formed on the pixel electrode connected to the drain electrode through the second and first contact holes". Claims 19, 20 and 28 depend from claim 17. These dependent claims are also allowable due to their dependency on the allowable base claim 17. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 12, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. (US 20030067570) in view of Baek et al. (US 20020036730).

Amended claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, a color pixel directly contacting an upper substrate without an intervening layer. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Okamoto, Baek, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the above-claimed features.

Baek does not disclose or suggest color pixel directly contacting an upper substrate without an intervening layer. In contrast, a passivation layer (160) is disposed between an upper substrate (150) and a color filter (170) in a reflective portion C. Further, Okamoto is completely silent on the above-claimed features. Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Okamoto and Baek were combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest a color pixel directly contacting an upper substrate without an intervening layer.

Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over Okamoto in view of Baek. Claims 9, 12 and 14-16 depend from claim 8. Thus, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons provide above for the base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. (US 20030067570) and Baek et al. (US 20020036730) in view of Ha et al. (US 6704081).

Claim 13 depends from claim 8. As above, neither Okamoto, Baek, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests a color pixel directly contacting an upper

substrate without an intervening layer. Ha does not cure the deficiency in this regard. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable over Okamoto in view of Baek and further in view of Ha. As such, withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. (US 20030067570) and Baek et al. (US 20020036730) in view of Nakashima.

Claim 26 depends from claim 8. As above, neither Okamoto, Baek, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests a color pixel directly contacting an upper substrate without an intervening layer. Nakashima does not cure the deficiency in this regard. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable over Okamoto in view of Baek and further in view of Nakashima. As such, withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 32 is claim 29 rewritten in independent form.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Jaewoo Park
Ltd./Rec. No. L0302
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889